



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,495	06/25/2003	Thomas E. Creamer	N0484.70557US00	3535
23628 7590 02/16/2010 WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C. 600 ATLANTIC AVENUE BOSTON, MA 02210-2206				
EXAMINER				
NEWAY, SAMUEL G				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2626				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/16/2010		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/603,495

**Applicant(s)**

CREAMER ET AL.

**Examiner**

SAMUEL G. NEWAY

**Art Unit**

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-10 and 22-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-10 and 22-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This is responsive to the amendment after non-final filed on 26 October 2009.
2. Claims 1-3, 5-10, and 22-26, of which claims 25 and 26 are new, are pending and considered below.

### ***Response to Amendment***

3. The 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections of claims 22-24 are withdrawn.

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 26 October 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the art rejections of claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10, Applicants argue that Jong and Kreda are not combinable because "the combination involves graphical elements being input to a component that accepts only text as an input". In particular Applicants take issue with the Examiner interpretation of Kreda in col. 7, lines 6-8. In this respect, Applicants argue: " cited passage of Kreda (col. 7, lines 6-8) is not describing alternatives, but rather is describing that different inputs will be translated into different types of outputs, according to standard practice. The passage mentions that the outputs may be numbers, acronyms, icons or abbreviations. Contrary to the implication in the Office Action, the passage does not describe an alternative in which all inputs are translated to numbers and an alternative in which all inputs are translated to acronyms, and

Art Unit: 2626

yet other alternatives in which all inputs are translated to icons or abbreviations, respectively. Rather, the passage should be fairly read as describing a system that translates text into a mix of numbers, acronyms, icons and abbreviations, with the mix depending on the specific content of the input text". The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Kredo discloses the "translation may change select words or phrases into numbers, acronyms, icons, or abbreviations, as is standard practice for IM" (emphasis added). It is clear from this citation and the emphasized term "or" (which implies the different translations in the alternative) that some select words can be translated to textual data per se (acronym or abbreviation). For example "Laughing Out Loud" would be translated to "LOL" which is purely text and on which speech synthesis can be performed. In other words, contrary to Applicants' assertion, it is not necessary for Kredo's output to comprise graphical elements.

Applicants note that "The Office Action points to a passage of Kredo (col. 8, lines 29-33) that describes text to speech conversion. Presumably, the Office Action implies that this passage of Kredo teaches that the output of the translator, including graphical elements, is converted to speech". However, the passage was cited to show that Kredo teaches text-to-speech and not to show converting graphical elements to speech.

Applicants also argue that Kredo and Marko cannot be combined because Kredo may output non-textual elements. However, as presented in the above arguments, non-textual outputs are not required and only textual elements may be output.

Regarding the art rejections of claims 22 and 24, Applicants argue that the cited references fail to teach sending speech in messages using SMS. However, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., sending speech in messages using SMS) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicants also argue that Jong's phones cannot communicate using Astrom's SMS technology because Jong's phones are connected to computing gateways with access to the internet. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. There is no reason why a properly enabled phone connected to gateways as disclosed in Jong can also send text messages using SMS. It is also noted that Applicants' own phones perform on-line chats, implying an internet connection, while also being enabled to send SMS messages.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2626

6. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jong (USPN 6,173,250) in view of Kredo et al (USPN 6,816,578) and in further view of Marko et al. (USPGPub 2004/0049389).

Claim 1:

Jong discloses a method of reducing bandwidth requirements in an on-line chat system (col. 1, line 65 to col. 2, line 5), comprising the steps of:

receiving a speech input at a calling party ("receiving audio input signals from the user", col. 3, lines 13-20);

transcribing the speech input to a text message in a same language ("converting them into textual representations", col. 3, lines 13-20);

converting the text message to an alternative text message based upon at least one of a calling party profile and a called party profile ("translates the text data into text data of the selected language ...", col. 9, lines 6-11, FIG. 9 and related text. Note that the specific selected language is a called party's profile) wherein at least one of said profiles specifies replacing at least a portion of said text message with an alternative text portion having a same meaning as said replaced portion of said text message (the translation has the same meaning as the text data).

However, Jong does not explicitly disclose converting the text message to an alternative text in the same language wherein the alternative text message has a shorter length than the replaced text message.

Art Unit: 2626

In a similar instant messaging system, Kredo discloses converting a text message into an "appropriate short hand representation" (col. 8 lines 18-25).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Kredo's short hand representations in Jong's translation dictionary because using acronyms and abbreviations is standard practice for instant messaging systems (Kredo, col. 7, lines 6-8).

Furthermore, Jong and Kredo do not explicitly disclose compressing the translated text message prior to transmission.

Marko discloses a similar method of transmitting text messages where the text messages are compressed prior to transmission ("compress the text prior to transmission ...", [0021]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to compress text messages prior to transmission in order to "reduce the required channel bit rate" (Marko, [0021]).

Jong further discloses transmitting the text stream to a called party ("textual representations are the sent to the subscriber terminal", col. 3, lines 13-20);

receiving the alternative text message by the called party as the text stream ("communication is achieved by the sending of continuous streams of text data", col. 3, lines 20-24); and

rendering the alternative text message by converting the alternative text message into speech output at the called party substantially in real-time ("the

Art Unit: 2626

text data ... may be forwarded to the text to speech conversion device... where the text data is converted ... enabling real time speech communication using text data transmission", col. 5, lines 25-33).

Claim 2:

Jong, Kredo and Marko disclose the method of claim 1, Jong further discloses, wherein the method further comprises the step of sending a voice signature of the calling party to the called party ("a speech pattern of the party actually sending the text data may be stored ... in order to obtain a synthesized speech output", col. 6, lines 28-31).

Claim 3:

Jong, Kredo and Marko disclose the method of claim 1, Jong further discloses, wherein the method further comprises the step of maintaining a voice signature repository of the calling party for access by a called party of a voice signature of the calling party when receiving a call from the calling party ("a speech pattern of the party actually sending the text data may be stored in the speech pattern database ... in order to obtain a synthesized speech output", col. 6, lines 28-31).

Claim 5:

Jong, Kredo and Marko disclose the method of claim 2, Jong further discloses, wherein the alternative text message is converted at the called party to the speech output by using text-to-speech conversion in conjunction with the voice signature of the calling party ("the text to speech converter 407



Art Unit: 2626

converts the text data into speech output signals using synthesized speech pattern", col. 6, lines 13-16, "a speech pattern of the party actually sending the text data may be stored ... in order to obtain a synthesized speech output", col. 6, lines 28-31).

Claim 6:

Jong, Kredo and Marko disclose the method of claim 1, Jong further discloses, wherein the method further comprises the step of translating the alternative text message to another language to provide a translated alternative text message ("the language translator 900 performs language translation", col. 9, lines 14-19).

Claim 7:

Jong, Kredo and Marko disclose the method of claim 6, Jong further discloses, wherein the step of transmitting comprises the step of transmitting the translated alternative text message ("the speech recognition device 203 outputs text data in a selected language", col. 8, lines 61-64).

Claim 9:

Jong, Kredo and Marko disclose the method of claim 6, Jong further discloses, wherein the step of converting translated alternative the text message is converted at the called party to the speech output by using text-to-speech synthesis in conjunction with the voice signature of the calling party ("the text to speech converter 407 converts the text data into speech output signals using synthesized speech pattern", col. 6, lines

Art Unit: 2626

13-16, "a speech pattern of the party actually sending the text data may be stored ... in order to obtain a synthesized speech output", col. 6, lines 28-31).

Claim 10:

Jong, Kredo and Marko disclose the method of claim 6, Jong further discloses, wherein the method further comprises:

adding the translated alternative text message to the data stream ("textual representations are the sent to the subscriber terminal", col. 3, lines 13-20);

displaying the translated alternative text message in the called party's location substantially in real time ("the text data can be displayed", col. 5, lines 24-30).

7. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jong (USPN 6,173,250) in view of Kredo et al (USPN 6,816,578) in further view of Marko et al. (USPGPub 2004/0049389) and in further view of Flanagan et al. (USPN 6,339,754).

Claim 8:

Jong, Kredo and Marko disclose and make obvious the method of claim 6, however, none of Jong, Kredo or Marko explicitly disclose, wherein the step of translating the alternative text message occurs in a server on a network coupled between the calling party and the called party.

Art Unit: 2626

Flanagan discloses a speech translation system similar to Jong's where "translation services are provided by one or more dedicated servers ..." (col. 6, lines 46-50).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use translation servers as suggested by Flanagan, for the translation step in Jong's method in order to avoid every device used in Jong's system having to be equipped with a translation system and use a common translation system on a network as is well known in the computing arts.

8. Claims 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jong (USPN 6,173,250) in view of Astrom (USPN 5,579,372).

Claim 22:

Jong discloses a method of reducing bandwidth requirements in an on-line chat system between a first party and a second party (col. 1, line 65 to col. 2, line 5), the method comprising the steps of:

with a mobile phone ("subscriber terminals 100 and 110 may be ... telephones (wired or wireless", col. 2, line 65 to col. 3, line 3), receiving a speech input at a calling party; within the mobile phone, transcribing the speech input to a text message in a same language ("subscriber terminal 100 may then initiate communication with subscriber terminal 110 via the data network 150 by receiving audio input signals from the user and converting

Art Unit: 2626

them into textual representations of the audio input signals", col. 3, lines 13-20); and

transmitting from the mobile phone a stream of the text directed to the second party ("textual representations are then sent to the subscriber terminal 110 ... realtime communication is achieved by the sending of continuous streams of text data over the data network 150", col. 3, lines 13-24).

However, Jong does not explicitly disclose transmitting the stream using the SMS messaging protocol.

It is old and well known to use SMS to send text messages in mobile phones, as is disclosed in Astrom (col. 1, lines 6-9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to have transmitted Jong's text data stream using Astrom's method because SMS is a widely used standard for mobile phone text messaging.

Claim 24:

Jong in view of Astrom discloses the method of claim 22, Jong further discloses:

converting the text in the stream of SMS messages to speech ("text to speech converter 407 converts the text data into speech output signals", col. 6, lines 13-16); and

rendering the speech as an output to the second party ("speech output signals are then output to the receiving party through the speech output device 211", col. 6, lines 19-20).

9. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jong (USPN 6,173,250) in view of Astrom (USPN 5,579,372) in further view of Marko et al. (USPGPub 2004/0049389).

Claim 23:

Jong in view of Astrom discloses the method of claim 22, however, neither Jong nor Astrom explicitly discloses compressing the text message prior to transmission.

Marko discloses a similar method of transmitting text messages where the text messages are compressed prior to transmission ("compress the text prior to transmission ...", [0021]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to compress text messages prior to transmission in order to "reduce the required channel bit rate" (Marko, [0021]).

10. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jong (USPN 6,173,250) in view of Kredo et al (USPN 6,816,578) and in further view of Astrom (USPN 5,579,372).

Claim 25:

Jong discloses a method of reducing bandwidth requirements in an on-line chat system between a first party and a second party (col. 1, line 65 to col. 2, line 5), the method comprising the steps of:

with a mobile phone ("subscriber terminals 100 and 110 may be ... telephones (wired or wireless", col. 2, line 65 to col. 3, line 3), receiving a speech input at a calling party; within the mobile phone, transcribing the speech input to a text message in a same language ("subscriber terminal 100 may then initiate communication with subscriber terminal 110 via the data network 150 by receiving audio input signals from the user and converting them into textual representations of the audio input signals", col. 3, lines 13-20); and

transmitting from the mobile phone a stream of the text directed to the second party ("textual representations are then sent to the subscriber terminal 110 ... realtime communication is achieved by the sending of continuous streams of text data over the data network 150", col. 3, lines 13-24); and

translating, for at least a portion of the text message, the text of the portion before delivery to the second party ("translates the text data into text data of the selected language ...", col. 9, lines 6-11, FIG. 9 and related text).

However, Jong does not explicitly disclose the translation being performed within a voice portal server.

In a similar instant messaging system, Kredo discloses translating a portion of text within a voice portal server before delivery to a second party ("The text is delivered to the IM proxy server 26 (step 152),

Art Unit: 2626

which translates or otherwise creates an IM message for delivery to user B (step 154", col. 7, lines 2-11).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have performed Jong's translation using a server as disclosed in Kredon in order to take advantage of the computing prowess provided by the server.

Further, Jong and Kredon do not explicitly disclose transmitting the stream using the SMS messaging protocol.

It is old and well known to use SMS to send text messages in mobile phones, as is disclosed in Astrom (col. 1, lines 6-9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to have transmitted Jong's text data stream using Astrom's method because SMS is a widely used standard for mobile phone text messaging.

Claim 26:

Jong, Kredon, and Astrom disclose the method of claim 25, Jong further discloses wherein the speech is transcribed into text in a first language ("subscriber terminal 100 may then initiate communication with subscriber terminal 110 via the data network 150 by receiving audio input signals from the user and converting them into textual representations of the audio input signals", col. 3, lines 13-20).

However, Jong does not explicitly disclose wherein translating comprises converting the transcribed text into alternative text in the same language.

Art Unit: 2626

In a similar instant messaging system, Kredo discloses converting a text message into an "appropriate short hand representation" in the same language (col. 8 lines 18-25).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Kredo's short hand representations in Jong's translation dictionary because using alternative text such as acronyms and abbreviations is standard practice for instant messaging systems (Kredo, col. 7, lines 6-8).

### ***Conclusion***

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.



Art Unit: 2626

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SAMUEL G. NEWAY whose telephone number is (571)270-1058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30AM - 5:30PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David R Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David R Hudspeth/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626

/S. G. N./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2626